R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 293 VT 001 570

RESEARCH IN HOME ECONOMICS GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT, FIVE PILOT PROJECTS IN MISSISSIPPI, 1965-66. PRELIMINARY REPORT NUMBER 15.

BY- WITT, MILDRED R. WALL, JAMES E.
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIV., STATE COLLEGE

REPORT NUMBER PR-15 PUB DATE DEC 66
MISSISSIPPI STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, JACKSON
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.40 35P.

DESCRIPTORS- *OCCUPATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS, *PILOT PROJECTS, *PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION, RECORDS (FORMS), JACKSON, RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT

PROJECTS FOR TRAINING PERSONS FOR WAGE EARNING OCCUPATIONS REQUIRING HOME ECONOMICS COMPETENCIES WERE CONDUCTED TO OBTAIN DIRECTION AND GUIDELINES FOR SIMILAR CLASSES IN MISSISSIPPI. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES WERE TO--(1) EXPLORE VARIOUS PROCEDURES FOR ORGANIZING CLASSES IN LOCAL COMMUNITIES, (2) SECURE INFORMATION ON LOCAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, (3) EXPLORE POSSIBILITIES FOR JOB PLACEMENT AND FOLLOWUP OF TRAINEES, (4) DEVELOP CURRICULUM MATERIALS IN CHILD CARE, CLOTHING, FAMILY, AND FOOD SERVICES, AND (5) PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR STUDENT TEACHERS TO OBSERVE THESE PROGRAMS. PROGRAMS WERE OFFERED IN FOOD SERVICES, CLOTHING SERVICES, CHILD CARE SERVICES, FAMILY SERVICES, AND ASSISTANT HOMEMAKING SERVICES. THEY WERE SPONSORED BY THE FIVE STATE COLLEGES WITH TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN HOME ECONOMICS. THE 201 TRAINEES WERE FROM 18 TO 61 YEARS OF AGE, AND INCLUDED PERSONS ALREADY EMPLOYED BUT WANTING TO UPGRADE THEIR SKILLS. CURRICULUM MATERIALS WERE DEVELOPED IN FOUR AREAS. THE PROJECTS INDICATED THAT THE PROGRAM MUST BE FLEXIBLE AND THAT QUALIFIED INSTRUCTORS MUST BE AVAILABLE. THE INVESTIGATOR RECOMMENDED THAT THE CLASSES BE CONTINUED WHERE NEEDED, JOB ANALYSIS SHOULD PRECEDE THE CLASSES, AND WORK EXPERIENCE SHOULD BE REQUIRED. OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE AND GUIDELINES WERE ESTABLISHED. FORMS USED IN THE PROGRAM ARE INCLUDED. (MS)

ED011293

MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH CENTER

RESEARCH IN HOME ECONOMICS GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT: FIVE PILOT PROJECTS IN MISSISSIPPI -- 1965-1966

MILDRED R. WITT

JAMES E. WALL

Preliminary Report No. 15

In cooperation with The Division of Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State Department of Education, Jackson, Mississippi.

The information reported herein was partially supported by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

VT015790

Preliminary Report No. 15

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

December, 1966

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RESEARCH IN HOME ECONOMICS GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT:

FIVE PILOT PROJECTS IN MISSISSIPPI---1965-1966

Compiled by:

Mildred R. Witt
Department of Home Economics
Mississippi State College for Women

Edited by:

James E. Wall
Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational-Technical Education
S O C I A L S C I E N C E R E S E A R C H C E N T E R
Mississippi State University

In cooperation with:

The Division of Vocational-Technical Education
Mississippi State Department of Education
Jackson, Mississippi

and with partial support from:

The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

PREFACE

The Social Science Research Center (SSRC) at Mississippi State University supports various projects in its program of research in OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION AND MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT. Each of these projects is focused upon the derivation of information that will be useful in the development of human resources. Information derived thus far in this research program is included in the following publications:

1. Influential Factors Concerning Human Resources in Mississippi, by James E. Wall. Preliminary Report No. 11, Education Series No. 1.

2. Research in Home Economics Gainful Employment: Five Pilot Projects in Mississippi---1965-1966, by Mildred R. Witt and James E. Wall. Preliminary Report No. 15, Education Series No. 2.

The five pilot projects for training in wage-earning occupations requiring home economics competencies reported herein were conducted primarily to determine if such programs were really needed in Mississippi. Their success is mute testimony to support their continuation and expansion.

This report is aimed at bringing to the reader's attention some of the methods and techniques used in organizing and conducting home economics gainful employment training programs in local communities. The report might be used (1) by teachers who wish to conduct such programs for adults and out-of-school youth, (2) by teachers who wish to offer such training in their regular secondary school programs, and (3) by administrators and supervisors who are contemplating the implementation of such training in their local school systems.

A number of persons were involved in planning and conducting the five pilot projects reported herein. The following persons attended a two-day planning conference in September, 1965: Dr. Louise Burnette, Teacher Educator, University of Mississippi; Dr. June Cozine, Consultant, Oklahoma State University; Dr. Bertha Fritzsche, Teacher Educator, University of Southern Mississippi; Mrs. Linelle N. Grier, Teacher Educator, Alcorn A. & M. College; Dr. Phoebe T. Harris, Head of Home Economics Department, Mississippi State University; Dr. Marquita Irland, Head of Home Economics Education Department, Mississippi State College for Women; Dr. Harold F. Kaufman, Director of Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University; Mrs. Katherine Leonard, Teacher in Adult Education, Mississippi State College for Women; Mrs. Allene McCormick, Head of Department of Home Economics, Delta State College; Mrs. Clara Merrifield, Teacher Educator, University of Mississippi; Mrs. Mary E. Pope, Teacher Educator, Mississippi State College for Women; Mr. A. G. Shepherd, Jr., Research Coordinator, Division of Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State Department of Education; Dr. James E. Wall, Director of Research Coordinating Unit, Mississippi State University; Miss Ruth Wallace, State Supervisor of Home Economics, Division of Vocational-Technical Education, Mississippi State Department of Education; and Dr. Mildred R. Witt, Teacher Educator, Mississippi State College for Women.

The two-day planning conference culminated in the establishment of project guidelines (see Appendix A) and the appointment of Dr. Mildred R. Witt as State Coordinator of the five pilot projects. The location, subject offered, sponsoring institution, and instructor for each project were:

1. Brookhaven, Food Services, Alcorn A. & M. College, Miss Nancy Joiner

2. Cleveland, Clothing Services, Delta State College, Mrs. Beulah Lewis

3. Columbus, Child Care Services, Mississippi State College for Women, Mrs. Katherine Leonard

4. Laurel, Family Services, University of Southern Mississippi, Mrs. Margaret Wilson

5. Tupelo, Assistant Homemaking Services, University of Mississippi, Mrs. Eleanor Weatherford

A special debt of gratitude is owed to Dr. June Cozine of Oklahoma State University who took time away from a very busy schedule to act as consultant in this program.

M.R.W.
J.E.W.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Statement of Problem. 1

Objectives 2

Procedure. 2

Findings 3

Summary. 10

Conclusions. 11

Recommendations. 12

Appendices

Appendix A. 14

Appendix B. 15

Appendix C. 18

Appendix D. 19

Appendix E. 21

Appendix F. 25

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

One of the most important trends in the composition of the labor force in Mississippi has been the large increase in women workers. According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, in 1940 women composed only 24.3 percent of the labor force, whereas in 1960 the figure had reached 33.9 percent. Most of the increase was caused by the influx of white females. There was a 97.3 percent increase of white female workers from 1940 to 1960. The data in Table 1 show the composition over a 20-year period according to sex and race. Figures pertaining to the sex composition of the labor force after 1960 were unobtainable at the time this report was compiled.

The trend of more women entering the labor force is continuing. Most of these women are married, many with children under eighteen. Many seek only part-time employment, but more and more work outside the home except when they have young children to care for. Because most women marry young, they complete their families by their late twenties and have their youngest child in school by the age of thirty-five.

Table 1. Persons in Mississippi's Labor Force, by Sex and Color: 1940-1960 (In Thousands and Percent)

Population characteristics	1960	1950	1940	Percent change, 1940-60
Total population, 14 years old and over	1,439	1,481	1,520	- 5.3
White	893	852	792	12.8
Male	439	424	397	10.6
Female	454	428	395	14.9
Nonwhite	547	629	727	-24.8
Male	255	299	353	-27.8
Female	292	329	374	-21.9
Labor force	743	757	808	- 8.0
White	471	424	387	21.7
Male	326	331	314	3.8
Female	144	93	73	97.3
Nonwhite	272	332	421	-35.4
Male	171	238	298	-42.6
Female	101	94	123	-17.9

Source: Bureau of the Census.

Early marriage greatly increases the availability of women for work.

There are a number of reasons for the increase of women in the labor force. Women are better educated than formerly; they have improved skills; and they have a desire to employ these skills. More and more jobs are being automated; they require less manual work; thus women instead of men can fill many of them. The increased pressure of current high standards of living has caused more and more women to enter the labor force. Women feel they must help augment the family income. Thus, they assume dual responsibilities as homemakers and as wage-earners outside the home.

The tremendous influx of new industries into Mississippi, coupled with the rapid expansion of older industries, has created many new job opportunities for women because this industrial growth helped create a shortage of employable men. Frequently, women find jobs in the new and expanding industries. Other women find new employment opportunities that are created as a consequence of some women directly entering the industrial labor force. Many of these recently created opportunities have occurred in such fields as: food services, child care services, clothing services, family services, homemaking services, etc.

OBJECTIVES

The need for employees in the above areas prompted the conduct of the five pilot projects in home economics. The major purpose for conducting the projects was to obtain direction and guidelines for similar, more widespread home economics wage-earning classes in Mississippi.

The specific objectives for the pilot projects were:

1. To explore various procedures to use in organizing classes for gainful employment in local communities.

2. To secure information on employment opportunities at the local level.

3. To explore possibilities for job placement of trainees, evaluation of their work, and follow-up.

4. To develop curriculum materials in child care, clothing, family and food services.

5. To provide student teachers with the opportunities to see the role of wage-earning in the total home economics program.

PROCEDURE

Home economics teacher-educators from the sponsoring colleges and universities contacted superintendents in their local school areas to ask for cooperation in establishing the pilot projects.

The Mississippi state supervisor of home economics education, assistant state supervisors, and the coordinator of the projects met with local superintendents and county superintendents and explained the need for the pilot studies, the purposes of the project, and how the project would function.[1]

Instructors for the pilot projects were chosen at these meetings. Their first duties were to survey the community and/or talk to key leaders to determine the needs in the local community. The instructors made use of the advice given them by members of their previously appointed advisory committees. Recruitment of enrollees and the development of an instructional unit were additional responsibilities of the instructors. Publicity of the classes also was a task of the teachers.

At the first session of the class, pre-tests and check sheets were used to help determine the status of the enrollees and to indicate their interests.

The coordinator of the five projects and the assistant state supervisors kept in constant touch with the instructors and worked closely with them and the advisory councils. Members of the state department staff visited classes, participated in discussions and supplied information such as bibliographies, film catalogs, books, pamphlets, and other materials.

Two workshops were conducted for the instructors of the pilot projects. The second workshop focused on preparation for evaluation of the projects.

FINDINGS

The five instructors of the pilot projects indicated that the original objectives for the projects had been met to a highly satisfactory degree. Observations made by the supervisors and the coordinator affirm these indications. The objectives for each of the five projects are shown in Table 2.

There is always a serendipitous dimension in the conduct of any pilot project, and these five projects were no exception. In addition to meeting the original objectives, some of the instructors were greatly encouraged because additional ones were achieved. Some of these were: creation of desires for further study and self-improvement; provision of many types of work experiences that had not been foreseen at the outset; inclusion of extensive beneficial public relations aspects; acquisition of skills to enhance family meals as well as those served for the public; and initiation of closer working relationships among personnel in pre-school centers in the community.

The guidelines for the pilot projects suggested that ten persons be enrolled in each class. Table 3 contains information showing the enrollment in the projects, the average attendance, and the number of persons who merited certificates upon completion of their respective classes.

---

1. See Appendix B for copy of Form used in Applying for a Pilot Project.

Table 2. Original Objectives for Five Pilot Projects in Wage-Earning in Home Economics in Mississippi

Location of Project	Objectives
Brookhaven (Food Services)	1. To provide an educational program for prospective food service workers and to enrich the knowledge, attitudes, and skills of those persons already employed. 2. To develop a tentative curriculum guide for gainful employment in food services. 3. To project implications for home economics wage-earning programs. 4. To provide an experience for student-teachers to see the role of gainful employment in the home economics program.
Cleveland (Clothing Services)	1. To exercise intelligent use and care of equipment. 2. To develop skill in performing maintenance procedures on clothing. 3. To develop an understanding of garment fit. 4. To develop skills in performing basic garment alterations. 5. To learn acceptable methods of clothing construction. 6. To gain basic understanding of textiles in relation to use and care. 7. To become skilled in garment laundering and cleaning procedures. 8. To learn to make special types of garments and household accessories.
Columbus (Child-Care Services)	1. To provide an educational program for prospective child-care workers and to enrich the knowledge, attitudes and skills of those persons already employed in child-care centers. 2. To develop a tentative curriculum guide for gainful employment in child-care services. 3. To determine implications of secondary home economics wage-earning programs from the pilot project. 4. To provide experiences for student-teachers to see the role of gainful employment in the home economics program.
Laurel (Family Services)	1. To provide an educational program for prospective employment in homes. 2. To help dignify employment in the area of family service. 3. To develop curriculum materials that can be released for use in the state. 4. To provide opportunities for student-teachers to observe and participate in gainful employment with the help of the public school.
Tupelo (Homemaker's Assistant)	1. To provide preparation in homemaking to help women become better homemaker's assistants or maids. 2. To upgrade standards of homemaking in the homes of the women enrolled. 3. To give each one a feeling of worth and self-confidence and a desire to better herself.

Certificates[2] were awarded to those persons who attended at least two-thirds of the scheduled class meetings. In Columbus there were two classes, and at the Eva Harris School in Brookhaven there were two classes. Only one class was held at each of the other three centers.

The only established over-all criterion for selecting enrollees in these projects was that the participant could not be enrolled in the regular school program; therefore, enrollees were either school dropouts or adults. At Tupelo, enrollees were required to indicate that they had the desire to improve their homemaking skills. Women enrolled in the classes at Columbus had indicated to one of the District Welfare Day-Care workers either that they needed help in improving their skills or that they were interested in preparing for work in a Day-Care center. To participate in the project at Cleveland, the women must have been enrolled in home economics clothing units or they must have had considerable experience in clothing construction. Women being prepared in the courses in food services were required to have a health certificate or planned to get one. No age limit was set for enrollees in any of the classes. The ages of the trainees ranged from 18 to 61 years.

The instructors in each project were asked to use their initiative in recruiting participants and advertising their classes. A compilation of the methods used by these five teachers follows:

Used records from the local employment agency.
Talked with personnel in county and district welfare departments.
Talked with local Red Cross personnel.
Talked with Salvation Army personnel.
Received information at Rehabilitation Center.
Studied dropout rolls from local schools.
Studied records from schools with needy children.
Made surveys.
Made door-to-door contacts.
Talked with Cooperative Extension home economists.
Placed announcement in local newspaper.
Used TV announcements.
Used radio announcements.
Had classes announced at school.
Had classes announced at local churches.
Used results of survey already made by regular home economics teachers.

Table 3. Enrollment in Pilot Program

Location	Enrollment	Attendance	Merit Certificate
Brookhaven (Food Services)	30	17	7
Cleveland (Clothing Services)	8	4	4
Columbus (Child-Care Services)	20	14	14
Laurel (Family Services)	18	9	7
Tupelo (Homemaker's Assistant)	25	12	13
Totals	101	66	45

2. See Appendix C for copy of certificate.

Instructors in the five pilot projects surveyed their local communities to determine needs, or talked with key personnel in the local communities, or used the results of surveys that were already available or a combination of these.

During the early development of the projects, members of the local advisory committees gave invaluable aid to the instructors. Members of the advisory committees came from a variety of professions. Some of their occupations were:

Superintendent of city schools.
County superintendent of education.
Asssistant superintendent of city school.
Principal of high school.
Director of instruction, city school.
Home economics teacher.
Nursery school director.
Kindergarten teacher.
Teacher educator in home economics.
President of school board, businessman.
Editor of newspaper.
Director of community development program.
Social worker.
Homemaker.
Minister.
Woman in business.
Industrial employer and manager of a business concern.
Member of Chamber of Commerce.
Lawyer.
Medical doctor.

Some of the functions of the Advisory Committees were:

1. Helped draft an instrument to make survey of occupational needs and opportunities in community.
2. Assisted in making a survey and compiling results.
3. Assisted in recruiting class members and in interpreting project objectives to others.
4. Gave suggestions for meeting place.
5. Gave suggestions for resource people to use in projects.
6. Helped decide what people should be invited to attend classes.
7. Made suggestions as to content to include in classes, and helped establish short- and long-term goals.
8. Provided advice, assistance, and encouragement in locating jobs for trainees.
9. Helped in public relations work by establishing rapport between people in industry-business and personnel in the educational system.
10. Made suggestions for expansion and improvement of projects and classes.

Guidelines for the pilot projects[3] suggested that a minimum of 45 hours of instruction be spread over a maximum of six months. Table 4

---

3. See Appendix D.

has information which reveals the approximate number of hours spent in class.

In addition to these hours spent in class, provisions were made for field trips and observations. It was impossible to get an accurate estimate of the hours devoted to these experiences. Instructors at Brookhaven and at Cleveland devoted extra time to class members who missed classes because of illness or other unavoidable reasons. The nature of the courses helped determine the number of hours spent in lecture, demonstration or actual laboratory work.

The number of hours spent in each class per week varied in the different projects. The Tupelo project was begun in November, and it met once each week. The Homemaker's Service class in Laurel did not begin until March; so it was operated on a concentrated basis.

Instructors in the five projects submitted course outlines for their classes at the first workshop in Jackson in March. Since that time, curriculum materials have been developed for each area of home economics. These curriculum materials were developed and are available for duplication by the State Division.

Expenditures for the pilot projects are included in Table 5. In budgeting for future programs, the following items should be considered: salaries, travel, consultants, instruction materials and supplies, and communications and publicity.

Variations in instructors salaries depended upon qualifications and experiences of the individuals, the length of time they were employed, and the amount of time devoted to the pilot project. At the initial planning session, the consensus was that the instructors would be employed only part-time. Because of the difficulties involved in getting projects underway and in securing qualified instructors, some of the projects were organized on a full-time basis. The nature of the courses and the qualifications and experiences of the instructors helped to determine the amount of money that would be spent for consultants.

With one exception, Cleveland, stationery, paper and supplies were supplied by the local school. The telephone calls were taken care of locally in the Columbus program.

Table 4. Hours Spent in Class in Pilot Projects

Location of Project	Approximate Hours in Lecture and Demonstration	Hours in Demonstration	Hours in Laboratory	Total
Brookhaven	36	24	24	84
Cleveland	37	18	27	82
Columbus	69	--	--	69
Laurel	38	22	26	86
Tupelo	26	16	8	50

In all of the projects, student teachers from the sponsoring college or university visited the classes for observation and participation. When the student teachers first visited the projects, they participated informally in the classes. On other occasions they came to the classes prepared to participate in planned activities, such as: Giving demonstrations, preparing and presenting socio-dramas, introducing films, and leading in follow-up discussions.

In some instances they assisted in preparing materials for use in classes, typing materials, and getting equipment and supplies ready for the classes.

Three types of evaluation were used in these projects. First, the progress of the individual enrollee in each class was rated. The instructor in each project and the coordinator agreed that informal methods of evaluation should be used, because dropouts and adults might not respond too well to formal methods of evaluating. Data in Table 6 indicate some

Table 5. Expenditures for Pilot Projects

	Brook-haven	Cleveland	Columbus	Laurel	Tupelo	Total
Instructor Salary	2566.69	2800.00	1575.00	1466.00	1575.00	9982.69
Travel	102.20	19.45	56.37	60.00	-----	238.02
Resource People	-----	-----	115.00	10.00	90.00	215.00
Books	130.84	-----	86.46*	77.46	134.90	429.66
Pamphlets	-----	-----	-----	42.25	-----	42.25
Film Strips	15.75	-----	-----	22.50	3.25	41.50
Telephone	32.14	1.73	-----	1.66	4.00	39.53
Stationery	3.00	6.75	-----	-----	-----	9.75
Postage	5.00	4.50	-----	4.00	5.00	18.50
Local	8.00	-----	-----	20.00	10.53	38.53
Miscellaneous	-----	4.55	14.44	48.80	-----	67.79
Total	2863.62	2836.98	1847.27	1752.67	1822.68	11123.22

*This amount includes the books and pamphlets spent for the Columbus classes as well as those bought by the Coordinator of the five projects. It also includes the amount spent for the printing of the Gainful Employment Certificates.

informal ways in which class members were evaluated.

Two instructors reported tangible evidence of success in their evaluation of some individuals. Some enrollees received jobs before completing their class, and one enrollee changed positions to receive better pay and more satisfactory working hours.

A second type of evaluation encompassed an evaluation form[4] that was devised for evaluating each project. Portions of the information from these reports are included herein.

Table 6. Informal Methods of Evaluating Individuals in Pilot Projects

Location of Project	Methods of Evaluating
Brookhaven (food service)	Individual's participation in class discussion Actual performance in laboratory (observed by instructor) Actual performance on the job (observed by instructor) Actual performance at home (observed by instructor) Changes in personal appearance
Cleveland (clothing service)	Instructor evaluated changes in manipulative and judgmental skills as individual: a. constructed garments b. lined garments c. altered garments d. made curtains and draperies
Columbus (child care service)	Individual's participation in class discussion Individual's reactions to socio-dramas Individual's performance at work (observed by instructor) Changes in personal appearance
Laurel (family services)	Individual's participation in class Individual notebooks on home nursing Individual came to one class dressed for an interview Employer has spoken of improvement in attitude and personal appearance
Tupelo (homemaker's assistant)	Employers have told of change in appearance and performance Instructor observed change in posture, attitude and appearance Individual's participation in discussion and other class activities Instructor overheard conversation telling of change in health practices

4. See Appendix E.

Plans for follow-ups[5] to help determine the success of individuals and the projects as a whole include:

1. Visit places of work for observation of participant on the job and talk with employers about their performance.

2. Contact prospective employers to state qualifications of participants.

3. Leave names, addresses, and qualifications of project participants at local employment office.

4. Keep names and addresses of participants and permit them to phone instructors about possible job opportunities.

The final type of evaluation included an over-all look at all the projects, which has been one of the purposes of this report.

SUMMARY

Five pilot projects to prepare personnel for gainful employment in areas using skills in home economics were conducted during 1965-66 in Mississippi. These were sponsored by the five colleges and universities in the state that have teacher education programs in home economics.

The first of the pilot projects to help adults prepare for gainful employment began in Tupelo at the Carver High School. This project for Homemaker Assistants was taught by Mrs. Eleanor Weatherford. Mrs. Clara Merrifield, Home Economics Educator, University of Mississippi, assisted Mrs. Weatherford in getting this program off to a good start. Thirteen adults received certificates for attending at least two-thirds of the class sessions.

Two classes for personnel, already employed or interested in becoming employed, in child care centers were conducted in Columbus by Mrs. Katherine Leonard. This project was sponsored by the Home Economics Department at MSCW. Both classes met in federal housing centers. There were 20 enrollees in these two classes, and the average attendance was 14. One of the important incidental results of these classes was the development of a much closer working relationship of personnel in various types of preschool programs.

Mrs. Beulah Lewis, a former college clothing instructor, directed a class preparing personnel for employment in clothing services. This project in Cleveland was sponsored by Delta State College. Some of the participants in this class plan to work in alteration departments in downtown stores and dry cleaning establishments, and some are sewing for the public but remaining in their own homes.

The class sponsored by the University of Southern Mississippi was taught in Laurel by Mrs. Margaret Wilson. This family services class helped prepare adults for employment in homes where there is illness, aged individuals, or working mothers. Work experience was required.

---

5. See Appendix F for follow-up form for trainees.

The fifth pilot project was in a county school, Eva Harris High, in Brookhaven. Miss Nancy Joiner, a recent graduate of Alcorn A. and M. College was the instructor. Approximately thirty enrollees in two classes in food services were given instruction to increase their knowledge and skills in food preparation so that they could find employment in restaurants, cafeterias, school lunch programs or other food establishments.

These projects were made possible by the Vocational and Technical Division of the State Department of Education in cooperation with the local school administration and county superintendents of education. Major purposes for conducting these projects were to explore procedures for organizing, conducting, and evaluating programs for preparation of personnel for gainful employment in home economics related fields; to develop tentative curriculum guides; and to provide programs for observation and participation of student teachers.

Members of the home economics teacher education staffs at the five colleges and universities have given full cooperation to these projects. They have worked with the individual instructors, have provided references and supplies, and have given moral support. Under their direction, student teachers have visited the projects and have had planned participations in the classes.

Instigators of these pilot projects realized that much time must be spent in carefully laying groundwork before these classes could begin. They also realized that the instructors would be challenged in planning and presenting the materials to the enrollees. Likewise, they did not underestimate the importance of the placement and follow-up of the accomplishments of the enrollees in the classes. Tentative plans have been made for a follow-up on participants in all five centers. A form has been devised for use in keeping a record of the advancement and placement of the trainees.

These projects have included participants who were already employed but who wanted to up-grade their skills and add to their knowledge in specific areas. Other participants enrolled so they could develop skills and increase their knowledge in specific areas in order that they might better find jobs in occupations using home economics skills.

CONCLUSIONS

The five pilot projects in home economics preparing personnel for gainful employment were, as a whole, successful. The following observations tend to verify their success.

1. Curriculum materials were developed in four of the subject matter areas.

2. These five pilot projects indicated that this type of program must be and can be flexible. Some classes met once a week, and others, twice. Some sessions lasted from one and a half to three hours, and others were three hours long. All classes did not meet in home economics departments. Some met in other class rooms in the schools, and others met at housing projects.

3. Qualified instructors for such programs are available. The instructors in these pilot projects had either had work experience in the areas they were teaching, or were willing to get work experience while on the job.

4. These classes either provided opportunities for the personnel enrolled to learn skills that would help them in finding a position using these particular skills in home economics or gave personnel already employed an opportunity to up-grade their skills in a particular area.

5. Attendance in the classes was good despite interruptions, such as bad weather, or agitation from out-siders who neither understood the true purposes of the projects, nor the sponsorship of them.

6. The opportunity for local home economics teachers, local administrators, members of the state department home economics staff, teacher educators and student teachers to work together in such projects was rewarding.

The pilot projects gave direction for planning future programs in wage earning for students enrolled in regular secondary classes and for dropouts and adults in special classes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In order for the home economics program in wage earning for dropouts and adults in Mississippi to continue and to be most effective, the following recommendations should be given consideration.

1. The five schools cooperating in the pilot projects should continue programs in wage earning, provided a need for such in the local community is indicated.

2. Job analyses should be made before other classes are begun. This would help identify functions of the course, define the responsibilities of the job and point out competencies needed to enter and advance in the job.

3. Work experience in preparing for wage earning should be a required part of each class.

4. Local businessmen should be contacted to determine their willingness to cooperate in providing work experiences.

5. Local homemakers should be contacted to see if they would cooperate in providing work experiences in their homes in the areas of child care and homemaker services.

6. Some agreement should be reached with businessmen and homemakers as to payment or non-payment for work experience.

7. A workshop should be conducted for all instructors who will be involved in wage-earning programs.

8. Definite plans should be made for a follow-up study of the personnel in the five pilot projects.

9. Careful consideration should be given to the possibility of conducting a pilot study in wage earning in home economics at the junior college level.

10. Possibilities should be explored for cooperating with other vocational services, as well as other agencies, in providing courses for wage earning.

11. A state-wide study should be conducted to determine the most acute needs for such programs and to provide valid information as to areas of service most needed in a particular locality.

12. A state-wide Advisory Committee on Wage-Earning in Home Economics should be appointed.

13. Organizations at the local level should be designated to serve as a "clearing house" to help enrollees find suitable jobs, i.e., local employment offices, etc.

14. Responsibility of initiating a statewide plan for a continuing program in wage earning in home economics should be given to a specific person.

APPENDIX A

SOME GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSED PILOT PROJECTS IN HOME ECONOMICS

Developed at Mississippi State University, September 28, 1965 by representative teacher educators in home economics from Alcorn College, Delta State College, Mississippi State College for Women, University of Mississippi and University of Southern Mississippi.

1. Pilot projects would be 100% reimbursable.

2. Pilot projects would be designed for out-of-school persons (dropouts and/or adults).

3. Pilot projects would be conducted by schools that already have reimbursable vocational programs.

4. Teachers in these pilot projects should hold a B.S. degree and be certified at the time they are employed.

5. Teachers in the pilot projects would work in close cooperation with the home economics teacher(s) in the regular programs.

6. Some money should be allocated for the services of skilled resource personnel.

7. Each local project would have a local advisory committee.

8. Personnel from the teacher education staffs of the colleges and universities would be expected to lend support in organizing the classes, developing the curriculum and planning evaluation of the projects.

9. Personnel from the teacher education staffs would expect to use these pilot projects for both student observation and participation.

10. The coordinator of the pilot projects would work in close cooperation with the state supervisor of home economics and her assistants.

APPENDIX B

Form:
Special Vocational Education II

Submit original and one duplicate to State Office

Application
for
Pilot Projects in Home Economics for Educating Personnel for Wage Earning

1. School: Give name and address of local school

_____

_____Telephone No._____

2. Title of Project

3. Description of Pilot Project

4. Indicate how the proposed project differs from present program or procedures, and what may be accomplished that is not already in practice. Include instructional emphasis that will be used in the project.

5. Objectives: List specific objectives to be achieved in the proposed project. They should be clear and capable of being attained by the proposed project.

6. Administration: Describe the administrative structure and the use of advisory groups.

7. Participants: Describe the criteria for selecting students and give the approximate number of students to participate in the project. (The number of students per class should be at least 10.)

8. Evaluation: Describe the evaluative procedure to be employed in order to determine the extent to which the objectives of the project will be achieved.

9. Time Schedule: In chronological order, indicate the approximate length of time required for each aspect of the project. (Begin by November 1, 1965 and conclude by June 1, 1966. See communication dated October 5, 1965 from Miss Wallace to determine some of the policies regarding this and other instructions.)

10. Personnel: (List the name, training, and experience of each person to work with the project.)

11. Budget:

	Amount Required for Pilot Project	
	From State Board Funds	From Local Funds
Personnel: (list individually)		
Instructor of pilot project	(Salary not to exceed $1575)	None
Travel for above	(not to exceed $350)	(any above $350)
Resource Personnel	(maximum $150)	(any above $150)
Educational Materials: (attach itemized list; receipts must accompany this)	Maximum $200	Any above $200
Supplies: (such as groceries)	None	Must come from local funds
Others: (itemize)		
Communications	Maximum $50.00	Any above $50.00
Total		

12. Agreement: It is hereby agreed that this is a cooperative project between the local school named above and the Mississippi State Department of Education, Vocational Division. It is further agreed that both parties will work together to achieve specific objectives set forth in this application to the maximum extent possible.

Signed _____ Date _____
Local School Administrator

Signed _____ Date _____
State Director of Vocational Education

Signed _____ Date _____
State Supervisor of Home Economics Education

Date approved: _____

GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT CERTIFICATE

HOME ECONOMICS DIVISION

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

_____ and State Department of Education certify that _____ has completed _____ hours of instruction in _____.

_____
State Supervisor
Home Economics Education

_____
Instructor

_____, 196__

APPENDIX D

October 5, 1966

TO: Heads of Home Economics Departments in reimbursed institutions

FROM: Ruth Wallace, State Supervisor, Home Econo[illegible] Education, Box 771, Jackson, Mississippi

RE: Pilot Projects

You are hereby advised to get the pilot project for teaching wage earning to adults underway as was agreed on at the meeting at Mississippi State University recently and approved by our Director and staff this week.

The plan to be used is as follows:

University of Mississippi--Child Development or Family Service--Oxford, Tupelo

Delta State College--Family Services--Cleveland, Bolivar County

Alcorn A & M College--Food Services--Brookhaven or Vicksburg

University of Southern Mississippi--Homemaking or Family Services, Clothing Service, Child Care--Hattiesburg

Mississippi State College for Women--Child Development, Clothing Maintenance Services--Lowndes County and Columbus

1. The pilot project is to be confined to teaching adults or out-of-school groups.

2. The State Board will reimburse the difference on the Instructor's salary between what the vocational teacher qualifies for on the minimum foundation education program and the salary paid, provided the salary does not have a professional certificate, or the amount qualified for under the minimum foundation education program for those teachers who do have a professional license.

3. In addition, the reimbursement of 100% is to be allowed as follows:

   $5[illegible] maximum to be allowed instructor per month for travel

   $50 per year maximum for communication (telephone, telegraph, stamps)

$200 per year maximum for illustrative materials (booklets, phamplets, audio-visual aids, and exhibits)

$150 per year for resource persons with prior approval from State Office

4. The school will provide supplies for class use (groceries, etc.)

5. Minimum of ten enrolled, average of seven in attendance.

6. Minimum of 45 hours of instruction spread over a maximum of six months.

7. Project could be used by the institution in their student teaching program.

8. Handled through local public school where a reimbursed vocational Home Economics teacher is employed or through a certified and qualified teacher.

9. School must be in compliance with Civil Rights Act.

10. Consultants and skilled resource persons may or may not be holders of the B.S. Degree.

11. Should have a local advisory committee or council.

12. Persons employed to head projects should be qualified and certified and work closely with the local vocational Home Economics teacher in the high school.

13. Should set up a four week training program for persons who are involved in these pilot projects.

14. State Supervisors and Assistant Supervisors will be in charge of the itinerant teacher education.

15. Should obtain certain information about trainees prior to participating in the project and also a follow-up program.

16. We hope that the pilot projects can soon get underway. Please keep me advised as to the developments and progress.

APPENDIX E

Form H.E. P. P. 3
Home Economics
Pilot Programs

State Department of Education
Vocational Education Division
Box 771, Jackson, Miss. 39205

EVALUATION FOR PILOT PROJECT
IN HOME ECONOMICS

_____ School or college sponsoring this program.

_____ Instructor for program.

_____ Area of instruction.

General Information

1. Give original objectives for the project (these were on the form submitted for approval of the program).

2. Were these objectives met?
   If so, how?

   If not, why not?

3. Were additional objectives met in the project?
   If so, please list these.

4. How many enrollees did you have in your project?

5. How were your enrollees recruited?

6. What criteria were used in selecting participants?

   employed? special skills? amount of schooling?

   unemployed? specify skills? health certificate?

7. Range in age?

   Set age limit?

8. What was the average attendance for each class?

9. How many clock hours were spent in each class?

   Divide this into number of hours lecture and discussion _____
   and number of hours of laboratory or work experience _____.

10. If you were to teach this course again, would you change the number of hours you spent on lecture-discussion and/or work experience? Specify how you would use the time.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

11. Please give names, addresses and positions of members of your advisory council.

12. How many times did your advisory council meet?

13. What were the functions of your advisory council?

14. How did members of your advisory council help you evaluate the program?

15. If you were to select an advisory council again, would you choose the same people again? Why?

16. In what other ways might you have received help from members of your advisory council?

17. Should functions of the advisory council be formulated before the members are chosen?

BUDGET

18. Personnel — Amount allotted — Amount spent
    A. Instructor's salary
    B. Instructor's travel
    C. Resource personnel (List each consultant individually and tell his qualifications, some of his work experience and the amount paid for his services. If his time and services were free, indicate this).

19. Educational Materials — Amount allotted — Amount spent
    Specify
    Books
    Pamphlets
    Film
    Filmstrips
    Other

20. How much local money was used for supplies?

    Itemize:

21. Communications:
    A. Telephone calls
    B. Stationery
    C. Postage

22. Were there any other expenditures?
    Specify:

23. What was the total amount of state funds spent?

24. What was the total amount of local funds spent?

25. If more than one course was taught, specify how much money was spent for each course.

MISCELLANEOUS

26. Please give the names and addresses of the enrollees in your course.

27. Indicate by each name above if the enrollee was employed prior to enrolling in the course. If she was, tell what she was doing.

28. Was there any change in employment status of each enrollee at the end of the course? If so, tell what the change was.

29. List the subjects covered in your course, the approximate time devoted to each of these.

30. What check have you already made on the enrollees?

32. If you continue with the program, what changes will you make or would you like to make for the improvement of the program? Why?

33. Did you use any on-the-job preparation?

34. Do you think the businesses or homes in your community would cooperate in providing on-the-job preparation? Why?

35. Have you talked to any members of your advisory council to learn if they think preparation on-the-job would be feasible?
Their response:

36. Have you talked to any employers about the possibility of on-the-job preparation?

37. Should they (trainees) be paid for this on-the-job preparation?

38. What provisions have been provided for finding employment for the enrollees in your class?

39. What aid would you like to receive from the state department if you continue in this program next year?

40. What aid did you receive from your college or university?

41. Did student teachers visit your classes? Approximately how many?

42. Did you have any student teachers participating in your classes?

43. If so, what were some of the things they did?

APPENDIX F

Form H.E.P.P.-1
Home Economics
Pilot Programs

State Department of Education
Vocational Education Division
Box 771, Jackson, Miss. 39205

PERSONAL DATA FOR HOME ECONOMICS PILOT PROGRAMS
FOR GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT

SCHOOL OR INSTITUTION:_____

ADDRESS:_____

TYPE OF PROGRAM:
Child Care Services ( ), Food Service ( ), Family Service ( ), Clothing Service ( ), Other (Specify) _____( )

NAME:_____, _____, _____ AGE:_____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

PRESENT ADDRESS:_____ PHONE:_____

PERMANENT ADDRESS (Next of Kin) _____

MARTIAL STATUS: Single ( ), Married ( ), Separated ( ), Divorced ( ), Widow ( ) (check one)

NO. OF CHILDRED: Boys_____ Ages _____
Girls_____ Ages _____

GAINFUL WORK EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO ENROLLING IN PROGRAM
(Begin with most recent job and work backward)

1. EMPLOYER: _____ _____
(Name of firm or business) (Address)

JOB TITLE: _____ PERIOD WORKED: FROM _____ TO_____

MAJOR DUTIES: _____

_____

WAGES AND/OR SALARY: Check figures that fit your salary or wage range.

Average beginning monthly salary (convert to monthly salary if paid by hour or week.)

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $299 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

After receiving instruction--Change in monthly salary or wage

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $299 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

Reason for terminating work: _____

2. EMPLOYER: _____ _____
(Name of firm or business) (Address)

JOB TITLE: _____ PERIOD WORKED: FROM _____ TO _____

MAJOR DUTIES: _____

_____

WAGES AND/OR SALARY: Check figures that fit your salary or wage range.

Average beginning monthly salary (convert to monthly salary if paid by hour or week.)

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $299 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

After receiving instruction--Change in monthly salary or wage

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $299 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

Reason for terminating work: _____

3. EMPLOYER: _____ _____
(Name of firm or business) (Address)

JOB TITLE: _____PERIOD WORKED: FROM _____ TO_____

MAJOR DUTIES: _____

_____

WAGES AND/OR SALARY: Check figures that fit your salary or wage range.

Average beginning monthly salary (convert to monthly salary if paid by hour or week.)

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $299 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

After receiving instruction--Change in monthly salary or wage

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $299 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

Reason for terminating work: _____

GAINFUL WORK EXPERIENCE AFTER COMPLETING INSTRUCTION

1. EMPLOYER: _____ _____
(Name of firm or business) (Address)

JOB TITLE: _____ PERIOD WORKED: FROM _____ TO_____

MAJOR DUTIES: _____

_____

WAGES AND/OR SALARY: Check figures that fit your salary or wage range.

Average beginning monthly salary (convert to monthly salary if paid by hour or week.)

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $299 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

Reason for terminating work: _____

2. EMPLOYER: _____ _____
(Name of firm or business) (Address)

JOB TITLE: _____ PERIOD WORKED: FROM _____ TO_____

MAJOR DUTIES: _____

_____

WAGES AND/OR SALARY: Check figures that fit your salary or wage range.

Average beginning monthly salary (convert to monthly salary if paid by hour or week.)

(1) ____less than $200 (3) ____$250 to $300 (5) ____$350 to $400

(2) ____$200 to $249 (4) ____$300 to $349 (6) ____Over $400

Reason for terminating work: _____

FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION

NO. OF VISITS: _____

DATE OF FOLLOW-UP: _____ LENGTH OF TIME ON JOB _____

CHANGE IN MARITAL STATUS: _____ CHANGE IN NO. OF CHILDREN: _____

CHANGES IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS:

PROMOTIONS: _____

WAGE AND/OR SALARY CHANGE: _____

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE:

PROMOTION: YES ____ NO ____

WAGE/SALARY UP: YES ____ NO ____

What parts of the course in employment were most valuable to you?

What parts of the course in employment were least valuable to you?

What would you like to have learned that was not included in the course?